

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, excessive stem material, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for normal alfalfa leaves and blossoms, poultry greens of good commercial quality, and in that an inferior constituent, stem material, had been wholly or in part added thereto.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, and in that the statements, "Alfalfa Leaves and Blossoms * * * Protein 21% Min. Fibre 12.50% Max," borne on the label, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On April 11, 1927, the A. W. Scott Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, conditioned in part that it not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15022. Adulteration and misbranding of feeds. U. S. v. 120 Sacks of Feed. Decree of condemnation entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21667. I. S. Nos. 15455-x, 15456-x. S. No. C-5332.)

On or about February 26, 1927, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 120 sacks of feed, at Birmingham, Ala., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Sturges Co., from Meridian, Miss., about February 3, 1927, and transported from the State of Mississippi into the State of Alabama, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance low in protein had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly and in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements "100 Pounds Net Bar Nun Dairy Feed Manufactured by The Sturges Company Meridian, Miss. Guaranteed Analysis: Protein, not less than 18%," with respect to a portion of the product, and "100 Pounds Net Big 6 Horse and Mule Feed Manufactured by The Sturges Company Meridian, Miss. Guaranteed Analysis: Crude Protein, not less than 11.30%," with respect to the remainder thereof, borne on the respective labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On March 16, 1927, the Sturges Co., Meridian, Miss., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, and it was further ordered that it be shipped to Meridian, Miss., to be reworked and reconditioned, and that it not be sold or otherwise disposed of until all Government requirements had been complied with.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15023. Misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. v. Landa Milling Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 19766. I. S. No. 8427-x.)

On May 24, 1926, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Landa Milling Co., a corporation, New Braunfels, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, under the name of the Landa Cotton Oil Co., on or about August 27, 1925, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of cotton-seed cake which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "This package contains 100 pounds (Net) * * * Landa Cotton Oil Co., New Braunfels, Texas."

Examination by this department of 55 unopened sacks of the article showed an average net weight of 94.63 pounds.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "This package contains 100 pounds (net)," borne on the tag attached to each of the sacks containing the said article, was false